

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                     | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/913,763                          | 12/21/2001  | John Robert Tagg     | 512585-2001         | 5286             |
| 7590 11/04/2003                     |             |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
| Frommer Lawrence & Haug             |             |                      | MELLER, MICHAEL V   |                  |
| 745 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10151 |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
| rew rolk, ivi 10151                 |             |                      | 1654                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No. Applicant(s)   |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action  | 09/913,763   | TAGG ET AL.  |  |  |  |
| Auvisory Action  | Examiner   | Art Unit   |  |  |  |
|  | Michael V. Meller  | 1654   |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app   | ars on the cover sheet with the  | correspondence address   |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 06 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.  | void abandonment of this applic<br>) a timely filed amendment whic   | ation. A proper reply to a h places the application in                                   |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR RI  | EPLY [check either a) or b)]   |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>a)</li></ul>  | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin<br>S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TI                | g date of the final rejection.<br>HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP                           |  |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 (c) | of extension and the corresponding amount<br>the shortened statutory period for reply<br>ce later than three months after the main | ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action, or |  |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be  | ecause:  |  |  |  |  |
| (a) X they raise new issues that would require further   | er consideration and/or search (   | see NOTE below);   |  |  |  |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);   |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application i<br/>issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>   | n better form for appeal by mate   | rially reducing or simplifying the   |  |  |  |
| (d) they present additional claims without cancel  | ng a corresponding number of f   | inally rejected claims.  |  |  |  |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection  | tion(s):   |  |  |  |  |
| <ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would<br/>canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>   | be allowable if submitted in a se  | eparate, timely filed amendment  |  |  |  |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See   |  | dered but does NOT place the   |  |  |  |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  | ause it is not directed SOLELY t   | o issues which were newly  |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed: none.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,4-23 and 27-40</u> .   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 24-26, 41-4   | <u>16</u> .  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. $\square$ The proposed drawing correction filed on is   | a) approved or b) disapp   | roved by the Examiner.   |  |  |  |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Other:   |  | Will   |  |  |  |
|  |  | Michael V. Meller<br>Primary Examiner  |  |  |  |

Art Unit: 1654

Continuation Sh t (PTOL-303)

Application No. 009/913,763

Continuation of 2. NOTE: the use of the terms, "A transgenic microorganism", "bacteriocidal" raises new issues since they were not presented before final.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the declaration and the amendments raises new issues. Applicants are presenting arguments that should have been presented before final. Caufield teaches the claimed protein and the microorganism from which it comes from.

^